

SW



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/688,837	10/17/2000	Shusuke Yamamoto	001358	1853

7590 12/09/2003

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN, HATTORI  
McLELAND & NAUGHTON  
1725 K Street, N.W. Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20006

EXAMINER

FERGUSON, MICHAEL P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3679

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SW

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/688,837

Applicant(s)

YAMAMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Michael P. Ferguson

Art Unit

3679

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: .

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 6 (line 10) recites "of the end portion only". It should recite --of the end portion being only--.

Claim 6 (line 11) recites "and expansion does not exceed the outer diameter of the shank". It should recite --and wherein the expansion does not exceed an outer diameter of a shank--.

Claim 6 (line 14) recites "rounded or arc". It should recite --rounded or arced--.

For the purpose of examining the application, it is assumed that appropriate correction has been made.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (USPN 5,520,269) in view of Uramoto et al. (USPN 4,642,011) and Hufnagl et al. (USPN 4,221,041).

As to claim 6, Yamamoto et al. discloses a pin connection structure for use in a floating type brake disc assembly having:

a hub 2;

an annular disc **1** which is concentrically disposed around the hub with a clearance therebetween;

the hub and the disc having plural sets of semicircular connecting dents **6, 7** opening toward the clearance to thereby form respective inserting holes; and

a hollow pin **20** inserted into each of the inserting holes with a washer **21** fitted on an end portion **20d** of the hollow pin which is subsequently caulked radially outward for fixing the washer in position, an inner diameter portion of the end portion being only slightly expanded by caulking the hollow pin, and wherein the expansion does not exceed an outer diameter of a shank **20a** of the pin (Figures 8(a) and 8(b)).

Applicant is reminded that process limitations are given no patentable weight in product claims. See MPEP § 2113. "The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. " In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695,698,USPQ 964,966 (Fed.Cir.1985).

Yamamoto et al. fails to disclose a pin connection structure wherein a hollow pin made of a metal having a surface-treated layer, and wherein the hollow pin is formed in advance into a rounded or arced convex shape in part of an inner periphery of an end portion of the hollow pin.

It would have been advantageous for a pin connection structure as disclosed by Yamamoto to have a hollow pin made of a metal having a surface-treated layer to prevent rusting and corrosion of the hollow pin, and for the hollow pin to be formed in advance into a rounded or arced convex shape in part of an inner periphery of an end portion of the hollow pin to provide for firmly joining a hub and disk without a main shank

Art Unit: 3679

of the hollow pin expanding during the riveting process, such expansion causing deformation and possible structural failure of the hub and disk material, and cracking in the surface-treated layer.

Uramoto et al. teaches a fastener made of a metal having a surface-treated layer for preventing rust and corrosion of the fastener (column 1 line 62- column 2 line 23, column 5 lines 25- 61; column 6 lines 54- 68; and Table 7).

Hufnagl et al. teaches a hollow pin **10** formed in advance into a rounded or arced convex shape **20** in part of an inner periphery of an end portion of the hollow pin; the convex shape providing for firmly joining two members without the main shank **14** of the pin expanding during the riveting process, such expansion causing structural failure in the joined members (Figure 1, column 1 lines 33-35, 48-64).

As in it would have been advantageous for a pin connection structure as disclosed by Yamamoto to have a hollow pin made of a metal having a surface-treated layer to prevent rusting and corrosion of the hollow pin, and for the hollow pin to be formed in advance into a rounded or arced convex shape in part of an inner periphery of an end portion of the hollow pin to provide for firmly joining a hub and disk without a shank of the hollow pin expanding during the riveting process, such expansion causing deformation and possible structural failure of the hub and disk material, and cracking in the surface-treated layer, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify a pin connection as disclosed by Yamamoto et al. to have a hollow pin made of a metal having a surface-treated layer as taught by Uramoto et al. to prevent rusting and corrosion of the hollow pin; and to be

Art Unit: 3679

formed in advance into a rounded or arced convex shape in part of an inner periphery of an end portion of the hollow pin as taught by Hufnagl et al. to provide for firmly joining the hub and disk without the main shank of the hollow pin expanding during the riveting process, such expansion causing deformation and possible structural failure of the hub and disk material, and cracking in the surface-treated layer.

As to claim 7, Uramoto et al. teaches a fastener made of aluminum alloy metal (column 1 line 62- column 2 line 23, column 5 lines 25- 61; column 6 lines 54- 68; and Table 7).

As to claim 8, Uramoto et al. teaches a fastener made of ferrous material (column 1 line 62- column 2 line 23, column 5 lines 25- 61; column 6 lines 54- 68; and Table 7).

As to claim 9, Uramoto et al. teaches a fastener having a surface-treated layer being an oxide corrosion-resistant film (column 1 line 62- column 2 line 23, column 5 lines 25- 61; column 6 lines 54- 68; and Table 7).

As to claim 10, Uramoto et al. teaches a fastener having a surface-treated layer being chromium plating and nickel plating (column 1 line 62- column 2 line 23, column 5 lines 25- 61; column 6 lines 54- 68; and Table 7).

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 6-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3679

***Conclusion***

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael P. Ferguson whose telephone number is (703)308-8591. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne H. Browne can be reached on (703)308-1159. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9326.

Art Unit: 3679

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1114.

MPF



**Lynne H. Browne**  
**Supervisory Patent Examiner**  
**Group Art Unit 3679**